Case 1:15-cv-08860-RA Document 41 Filed 12/14/15 Page 1 of 43

FC33ADAH Hearing UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK -----x 2 3 ADAR BAYS, LLC, Plaintiff, 4 5 15 CV 8860 (RA) v. 6 PUGET TECHNOLOGIES, INC., et al., 7 Defendants. 8 9 New York, N.Y. December 3, 2015 10 2:00 p.m. Before: 11 12 HON. RONNIE ABRAMS, 13 District Judge 14 **APPEARANCES** 15 GARSON, SEGAL, STEINMETZ, FLADGATE LLP Attorneys for Plaintiff 16 BY: KEVIN MURPHY MICHAEL M. STEINMETZ 17 THE FUNES LAW FIRM 18 Attorneys for Defendants BY: ALEJANDRO D. FUNES, Appearing via speakerphone 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

THE DEPUTY CLERK: In the matter of Adar Bays LLC v. Puget Technologies. Parties, please state your name for the record.

MR. MURPHY: Good afternoon, your Honor. Kevin Murphy of the law firm Garson, Segal, Steinmetz, Fladgate on behalf of plaintiff. With me is Michael Steinmetz from the same firm.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. FUNES: Alex Funes from the Funes Law Firm on behalf of the defendants Puget Technologies and Hermann Burckhardt.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Funes. Just so that you know, in the future I will not allow you to participate by phone except in extraordinary circumstances, particularly when it is something that's substantive in nature. But I understand that you have asserted that you received these papers just very last minute.

I did want to ask you though about the status of your effort to be admitted pro hac vice.

MR. FUNES: Yes, your Honor. Thank you again for letting me appear by phone given the short notice. My status with my pro hac vice, I had to file a second motion. The status of that is that the certificate of good standing from the State of Florida takes three to five days for me to receive it, and I will have to file a third motion including the certificate from the bar. Because right now, the motion that I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

filed, I have to include a temporary correspondence from the Florida Bar stating I am a member in good standing. And what I will be able -- the petition will go through the latest by Monday I believe.

THE COURT: All right. I'm sorry. See, this is the problem with doing it on the phone. I had trouble hearing you. The Monday after?

MR. FUNES: It would be this coming Monday.

THE COURT: On Monday. Is that what you said?

MR. FUNES: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FUNES: And I did file two motions, your Honor. They were denied by the clerk because the certificate issued by Florida was not issued by -- it was a temporary certificate issued by e-mail. And I will get the original certificate from the Supreme Court by U.S. mail, which I should receive either today, tomorrow, or Monday.

THE COURT: All right. In light of the exigency of these proceedings, I'll admit you pro hac vice subject to you making the proper filing by the end of next week. If there is a continued issue with that timing, I want a specific application for additional time.

MR. FUNES: Certainly, your Honor. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: So, you now have all of the papers,

2.2

23

24

25

Mr. Funes, is that correct? Both the complaint and the motion for preliminary injunction and for preliminary declaratory relief, correct?

MR. FUNES: That is correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: So, we have the papers. I'll hear from plaintiffs and then I'm happy to hear from you as well.

MR. FUNES: Very well, Judge.

MR. MURPHY: Your Honor, we've submitted the declaration of Aryeh Goldstein on the issues of substantial likelihood of success on the merits, irreparable harm and balance of the equities. We're happy to swear him in, enter the declaration into evidence, allow your Honor opportunity to question, allow counsel opportunity to cross-examine on the issues. We have sort of amplified questions of course based upon what Mr. Funes has taken issue with. So we're happy to proceed.

THE COURT: Why don't you do that.

Mr. Goldstein, good afternoon.

(Witness affirmed)

MR. MURPHY: Before I begin, I'd like to hand the witness what I've marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit A for identification.

THE COURT: Is this the declaration?

MR. MURPHY: This is his declaration.

THE COURT: Yes.

- ARYEH GOLDSTEIN,
- 2 called as a witness by the Plaintiff,
- 3 having been duly affirmed, testified as follows:
- 4 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- BY MR. MURPHY: 5
- 6 Mr. Goldstein, can you tell us what you do.
- 7 Yes, I am an investor together with one partner.
- public companies under Rule 144. And we've been funding this, 8
- 9 we do since this prior to 2000, for a very long time. We fund
- 10 different exemptions, we fund different public companies money
- 11 who need it.
- 12 You accomplish this funding through Adar Bays LLC?
- 13 Yes. Α.
- 14 Where is Adar Bays located? Q.
- 15 Α. It's in 3311 I believe Indian creek. Miami, Florida.
- Where do you live, sir? 16 0.
- 17 I live in New York. Α.
- 18 Does Adar Bay does any business in New York?
- 19 Almost exclusively. That's the reason -- my partner
- 20 actually moved down to Florida a couple of years ago, which is
- 21 why, he's more the pencil pusher, that's why it is there.
- 22 my meetings happen here in the city. I myself have an office
- 23 in Monroe, and my home office in Rockland County.
- 24 What is the significance of doing business in New York?
- 25 Virtually every company we meet comes here to the city, and

- we either make new connections or establish and strengthen 1 2 continuous connections. The same company repeat, and we do it
- 3 again, and do we make new and strengthen old connections and
- 4 it's always been in the city. It is the financial capital.
- 5 Q. Are you familiar with a dispute that's the subject matter
- of this case that is between Adar Bays and Puget Technologies? 6
- 7 Α. Yes.
- 8 Have you submitted a declaration in connection with the 9 dispute?
- 10 Α. Yes.
- 11 Is that the declaration before you marked as Exhibit A, is
- 12 that right?

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 13 A. Yes, correct.
- 14 I'd like you to go to page 14 of that declaration. Q.
- 15 THE COURT: Can I just break in and just ask one question of Mr. Funes. 16
- 17 Mr. Funes, are you contesting that jurisdiction is 18 proper in this court?
 - MR. FUNES: Yes, we do, your Honor. After the Court entered the order yesterday and throughout the case, really, we were prepared to dispute the jurisdiction, particularly over one of the defendants Mr. Burckhardt, but also over the corporation itself.
 - The agreement has a clause in which the parties waived venue in the forum of litigation. However, it is our position

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that that clause may not be enforceable. At this point we have two companies that are based in Florida, even though Adar has a second office in New York. Most of the witnesses that will be called to testify in this case are based in Florida. defendant himself is located in Florida. Any depositions will have to take place in New York and will require those witnesses to travel to the jurisdiction. This will cause significant costs for both sides to travel and litigate the case.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. FUNES: Aside from that clause, the parties have minimum contact, at least the defendants, with the State of New York. Very minimal, which I do not believe these contacts either meet the constitutional requirements or any other jurisdictional requirements.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. I'm sorry. have to take a short break because my transcript is not up. Ι hadn't set up getting realtime and I would like to have a transcript I can look at. So we are going to take a break momentarily.

(Recess)

MR. MURPHY: I would like an opportunity to respond to Mr. Funes' point.

THE COURT: I don't think that's necessary, actually. Because Mr. Funes, I have your letter of December 3rd. hadn't read it, but I have now. But, Section 5 of the contract

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

21

Goldstein - direct

specifically waives any jurisdiction, any objection to 1 2 jurisdiction and venue.

Mr. Goldstein, you can take the stand again.

I don't know exactly how you get around that.

MR. FUNES: Yes, your Honor. These clauses are not as strictly enforceable all the time. Particularly when it endangers public jobs. It is more convenient for the litigants to, to argue the case in another jurisdiction. As I stated --

THE COURT: So it is a forum non conveniens argument.

MR. FUNES: Correct.

THE COURT: I'm rejecting that argument and we're going to proceed. I didn't mean to interrupt the direct of Mr. Goldstein.

MR. FUNES: Very well.

THE COURT: You may proceed, Mr. Murphy.

16 BY MR. MURPHY:

- Q. I believe where we left off, Mr. Goldstein, is we were talking about your familiarity with the dispute between Adar Bays and Puge. Is that right?
- 20 Α. That's correct, yes.
 - You're fully familiar with that? Q.
- 22 Α. Yes.
- 23 I think I directed you to page 14. And if you can tell me
- 24 if that page bears your signature on the declaration?
- 25 Yes, it does. Α.

Goldstein - direct

- All of the exhibits that are attached to the declaration, 1 you reviewed and considered before signing that declaration, is 2
- 3 that correct?
- That's correct, yes. 4 Α.
- 5 Is the declaration and all of its contents and your
- assertions made about the contents of the declaration, 6
- 7 including the exhibits, true, correct, and complete?
 - Α. Yes.

8

9

10

- MR. MURPHY: Your Honor I offer up the declaration of Mr. Goldstein.
- 11 THE COURT: Yes, it will be admitted.
- 12 (Plaintiff's Exhibit A received in evidence)
- 13 Q. Mr. Goldstein, Mr. Funes has put in some opposition papers
- 14 where he has asserted that Adar Bays conducted itself by
- misrepresenting and committing fraud upon Puge and the Court. 15
- 16 Is that true?
- 17 Absolutely not. Α.
- 18 Have, has Adar Bays ever acted with another entity to
- 19 simultaneously request conversions from Puge Technologies?
- 20 A. Not with conversions and not with selling, never.
- 21 THE COURT: Can you just explain the relationship 22 between Adar Bays and Union Capital.
- 23 THE WITNESS: We're a competitor, we're competitors
- 24 and complementers, so to speak. We both do the same business.
- 25 But it is very often a company that needs a lot of money.

don't want to lay out the risk of that much money. Let's say 1 they need a million or half a million dollars. So we do part 2 3 of it and they farm it off to other people. Other people join

- and do the deal. Once we do close the deal, we have nothing to
- 5 do with each other until afterwards, until the next deal.
- 6 never work in concert with selling, nothing to do with each
- 7 other in that part.
- Q. Puge also accused Adar Bays of securing commissions on the 8 9 deal that is the note between Adar Bays and Puge. How do you
- 10 respond to that?
- 11 There is no such thing. We have terms of the deal.
- 12 don't take any commissions from anybody.
- 13 Q. Mr. Goldstein, if you did not get the requested relief in
- 14 this case, that is, the ability to enforce conversions, what
- 15 would happen?
- There is a very real risk that we'll lose our money in the 16
- 17 deal and the company itself may not be viable. There is a real
- 18 risk, it has happened in the past, and we look to prevent that
- 19 from happening now, and that's why we take these measures.
- 20 Why do you say there is a real risk in this instance?
- 21 Because the company that doesn't honor their commitments,
- 22 the word gets out to that effect, and they have a very hard
- 23 time raising money, they can't survive or have a harder time
- 24 surviving, I should say, and it is then, if they can't raise
- 25 the money, they can't stay current or they can't issue shares

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

money or --

and they slowly drift way. It's happened to me more than a dozen times. We're not looking -- it is a risky business.

- We're trying to keep the risk, you know, contained somewhat.
- One aspect of the note refers to a reserve requirement. 0.
- 5 Can you explain that to the Court.
 - A. Yeah. When we fund a company, just for numbers sake, if we give a company \$100,000. When we fund a company, the company is \$100,000 stocks and at a dollar a share. Normally we get the shares at a discount market. Let's say at 30 percent discount 40 percent discount, we would need 140,000 shares give or take. Oftentimes a company goes ahead and raises other

13 Talk really loudly and clearly and slowly THE COURT: 14 into the microphone particularly because Mr. Funes isn't going to hear you at all if you are not in the mike.

Sure. So, to allow for volatility in these stocks, we ask for a reserve that they shouldn't go ahead and give out shares to other people, and we will be left without any shares when it comes time to conversion. So we tell them up front we need a reserve maintained at the transfer agent in case the stock should have a drop, we'll have coverage to a certain amount. Similar to like a bank won't lend money on a house without having maintained proper security. It is the same idea. Why did you ask that the Court order Puge to increase its

reserve by issuing additional shares?

FC33ADAH

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

25

We're asking, well, it is the easiest way for the company to satisfy its obligation and certainly a quicker way. Nothing is speedy, but it is certainly a quicker way by increasing the authorized shares, it doesn't cost them money, it is something that's 90 percent they'll get right through within a matter of weeks. When you raise money, it could take a very long time, commitments never happens, it schleps for months and even longer.

So the simplest way to take care of the situation is by increasing the authorized and giving the shares as it's provided for in the documents.

MR. MURPHY: I have no further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Funes, do you have any questions for Mr. Goldstein?

> MR. FUNES: Yes, I do, your Honor.

Again, just very slowly and clearly in the THE COURT: questions because we're having trouble hearing you on the Thank you. phone.

- 19 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 20 BY MR. FUNES:
- 21 Mr. Goldstein. Ο.
- 22 Α. Yes.
- 23 What is the amount of the contract? What is the amount of 24 the total debt that is owed under this agreement?
 - The initial contract is for \$75,000, and there is

- Goldstein cross
- roughly -- I don't have the numbers in front of me -- roughly 1
- 2 50,000 plus to still convert. Plus interest and plus at this
- 3 stage of the game penalties as well.
- 4 So, Puget already complied with one-third of the Okay. Q.
- 5 total amount owed, correct?
- Α. Correct. 6
- 7 Okay. And Puget also honored prior issuance of shares so
- 8 that your company could convert those shares pursuant to the
- 9 contract, correct?
- 10 Α. Correct.
- 11 And those, those issuances of stock happened without
- 12 incident, correct?
- 13 Correct. Α.
- 14 Let me ask you something about the contract.
- 15 Α. Sure.
- Did the contract contemplate any problems with reaching the 16
- 17 maximum amount that a company could issue at any given point?
- 18 Can you just ask the question one more time, please?
- 19 Yes. Did the contract contemplate any problems if a Q.
- 20 company, in this case Puget, could not raise the required
- 21 shares because of -- because having reached a maximum number of
- 22 shares for selling on the offer of shares it could issue, did
- 23 the contract contemplate that problem?
- 24 There is different options for the company. But the one,
- 25 the obvious one is to increase the authorized shares which

- takes care of the problem. It is just like running out of 1 checks, you order more checkbooks. That's the one way. 2
- 3 Oftentimes companies have reserves for other investors that
- 4 have converted out of their position. They no longer have it
- 5 so they can free up those reserves. So there's different
- methods how to handle a situation. 6
- 7 Q. Right. Yeah, I understand. But the agreement did not
- anticipate or did not specify what the company would do if it 8
- 9 reached the maximum amount of shares that it could issue,
- 10 correct?
- 11 Correct. But some of the things are more common sense than
- 12 others. That would be one of them.
- 13 Okay. Now, in your opinion, any shares that are to be
- 14 issued by the debtor, in this case Puget, those shares would
- have to be held by an agent, by a third-party agent, right? 15
- A. Why do you say that? Either I'm not understanding the 16
- 17 question or I'm not catching it.
- 18 Q. Okay. So any shares to be delivered to Adar, those shares
- 19 are usually delivered by a third-party agent, and in this case,
- 20 that agent was a third party named Direct Transfer LLC, isn't
- 21 that true?
- 22 A. Yeah, the transfer agent issues the shares. If that's what
- 23 you're saying, that's correct.
- 24 Okay. Now, during prior delivery of shares, during the
- 25 contract, Direct Transfer held those shares in trust and then

Goldstein - cross

- those shares are delivered to Adar, isn't that right? 1
- 2 That's correct, yes. That's the reserve. Α.
- 3 Q. Even if the Court were to order Puget to deliver the
- shares, Direct Transfer could not comply with the Court order 4
- 5 because Direct Transfer would not have those shares in trust as
- 6 of right now, isn't that right?
- 7 That's correct. Yes.
- Okay. Now, did you know that in order to issue additional 8
- 9 shares above the ceiling or above the maximum authorized
- 10 amount, a company has to proceed with a special meeting and
- 11 obtain shareholder approval? Did you know that?
- 12 Α. Yes.
- 13 Hello? Ο.
- 14 Α. Yes.
- 15 THE COURT: He said yes.
- 16 MR. FUNES: Okay.
- 17 Now, and that's not something that happens overnight,
- 18 correct?
- 19 A. Correct.
- 20 Q. Now, in the contract, and I would refer you, do you have a
- 21 copy of the agreement by any chance?
- 22 A. Yes, I do.
- 23 Okay. Are you familiar with the funding lock up clause on
- 24 page eight?
- 25 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Can you please repeat that?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Can you please repeat that.

MR. FUNES: Yes.

- You're familiar with the funding lock up clause in the agreement, right?
- A. It's page eight? I'm familiar with the lock up clause, ves.
 - In that clause, it says that the company shall not consummate another round of financing for 30 days following the closing of the transactions contemplated herein. Right?
- I don't see it, but yes, that is correct. We did put a lock up clause that whatever amount they were looking to raise, they shouldn't go above that to raise more money which would go ahead and dilute and put a tremendous pressure on the stock.
- Q. Right. And were you aware that the company that you earlier stated used you were complementers, and that's the word you used, you were referring to Union LLC. Were you aware that Union Capital LLC entered into a similar contract with Puget on or about the same date in which Puget entered into the same contract with your company?
- A. Yes, I knew that Puge did a few different deals right around that timeframe, before and afterwards. Like I was trying to explain, Puge was looking to raise more money than we were looking to give them at that time. So I understood that was their round, but I didn't want them to do additional rounds because that would have more of a dilutive and pressure on the

1 stock

stock. That's why we have the lock up for no other rounds besides this round.

THE COURT: Can you explain that a little more fully please again into the microphone?

THE WITNESS: Sure. When a company looks to raise money, like let's say the one raised a million dollars and our comfort level is \$100,000 just for numbers sake. We understand they'll go around to other people to raise the other 900.

Often the company then does another raise and another raise and it becomes a very heavy pressure on the stock. There is too many dollars out there, people see, it is public knowledge.

And we ask for a lock up, give us 30 days, a chance for when the time comes we could sell it, it shouldn't be a lot of pressure following behind. It is only \$1 million selling and not \$5 million selling. Am I being clear?

This round they wanted, we did part of the round and other people did the other part. I understood. I wasn't comfortable giving them the whole amount they were looking for. I knew they went to Union and other people as well. It was on the street, so to speak. That was our comfort level. We said our next round there should be a 30 day lock up so there shouldn't be another \$1 million out. Things worked beautifully until they turned south on us. I don't know what happened.

Q. So, if you were to exercise conversion of the shares at a later time, your company would still get paid the \$75,000 it is

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

owed, correct?

- A. Are you asking that if we convert the shares, we'll continue converting the shares of what's left? Is that what you're saying?
 - Q. Yeah. If you were to convert these shares, assuming they don't. You would still be able to convert the shares let's say a month, a month from now. And still, you still would get the \$75,000, if we continued to convert the shares. Isn't that true?
 - If we continue to convert, we convert and sell out what we can get as per the agreement. Nothing changes.
 - Right. So, you could do it either today or you could do it a month from now or you could do it three months from now?
 - I can't convert it until you have the shares. Α.
 - Q. Right. So there is a process for the company to issue more shares, and it is not overnight like you stated, correct?
- 17 It is not overnight. But it is definitely, it is a 18 moveable quicker way to go.

THE COURT: Just let me ask a question, Mr. Funes. your view, what is the problem with that scenario of waiting to do it a month from now or three months from now?

THE WITNESS: So, just to understand what he's saying, the company has to go through a shareholder meeting to increase That can take a couple months. the authorization. We have to start the process. You don't start the process, it will never

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Goldstein - cross

We feel it is a quicker way for them to go. I have no issue with that. They haven't made any attempt to go and the stock is very volatile. The longer they schlep, the more we are exposed to tremendous risk. It is a risky business as is. It is very risky. The stock, it is a sub-penny stock, so there

THE COURT: Mr. Funes.

is not that much room to the twilight zone.

MR. FUNES: Yes, your Honor. Thank you.

- So you're talking about investment risk, right,
- 10 Mr. Goldstein?
- 11 Α. I'm sorry?
- 12 You're talking about an investment risk, correct?
- 13 In terms of waiting longer in terms -- I don't have an Α. 14 issue waiting for them, and we're here to encourage the company
- to increase their authorized. 15
- It is an investment risk for you, right? 16
- 17 It increases the investment risk, that's correct.
- 18 Right. But you are asking the Court to provide immediate
- 19 remedy because you are exposed to imminent harm and immediate
- 20 But if you can wait one or two or three months, then
- 21 we're not talking about immediate harm. Are we?
- 22 I just want to tell you, we do things very straight.
- 23 keep agreements. We were totally played around with over here
- 24 for no reason. If you're offering, if the company would ever
- 25 offer to increase the authorized instead of being so

adversarial, we wouldn't be here now wasting so much people's 1 time and money. It is totally one sided this whole situation. 2 3 THE COURT: Mr. Funes, can I go off the record for one 4 minute. 5 (Discussion off the record) 6 (Recess) 7 THE COURT: Mr. Funes, are you on the line? 8 MR. FUNES: Hi, yes. 9 THE COURT: I understand you're unable to resolve your dispute? 10 11 MR. MURPHY: That's correct. 12 THE COURT: Why don't we put Mr. Goldstein back on the 13 Please remember you're still under oath. stand. 14 THE WITNESS: Sure. 15 THE COURT: Speak into the mike. 16 Mr. Funes, do you have other questions for 17 Mr. Goldstein? MR. FUNES: Your Honor, I believe we've covered pretty 18 19 much everything, so at this point I have no other questions. 20 THE COURT: Do you have any redirect questions? 21 MR. MURPHY: I do, a few, your Honor. 22 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. MURPHY: 23 24 Q. Mr. Goldstein, Mr. Funes noted that Adar Bays had the

option to wait if Puge was interested in authorizing more

25

- 1 | shares. Do you remember that question?
- 2 | A. Okay.
- 3 | Q. Has Adar Bays asked for the issuance of more shares by
- 4 Puge?
- 5 A. Certainly. We requested the shares, and I mean, under the
- 6 contract, he is supposed to either deliver or take methods to
- 7 | cure it, which is increasing the authorized is one of the
- 8 | methods. That's all we asked him to do, just live up to the
- 9 contract. It's not that hard.
- 10 | Q. How long ago was that?
- 11 | A. We submitted the conversion -- can I look at the exhibit?
- 12 | Q. Of course. If it would refresh your memory.
- 13 A. Yeah, it certainly would.
- 14 October 14.
- 15 | Q. That's never been honored, right?
- 16 A. Nope. Nothing's been done as far as to honor it either.
- 17 | Q. How long has Adar Bays been waiting?
- 18 A. Since two, three days after that. So about two business
- 19 days after October 14. October 17, something like that.
- 20 | Q. Have you heard anything about Puge authorizing additional
- 21 | shares?
- 22 | A. Didn't hear anything. The only thing we got was a very,
- 23 very not nice thing from them. They filed very not nice stuff
- 24 | about us online.
- 25 | Q. You are referring to the civil threat letter?

Α. Yes.

1

- Is there continued risk for Adar Bays from waiting after 2 Ο. these conversion notes are not honored? 3
- 4 The company accrues expenses every single day, week,
- 5 month, and including filing if they are not able to raise the
- 6 money, they're, we risk, we just our risk grows literally every
- 7 single day unless something is taken to be cured. Then he is
- more likely to find other investors as well. If he doesn't, 8
- 9 the stock could just fade away and we'll be totally goofed.
- 10 So, Mr. Funes also asked you about Direct Transfer. Who is
- 11 Direct Transfer?
- I believe that's their transfer agent which issues the 12
- 13 shares for them. They are the ones who would have the reserve.
- 14 They hold the reserve.
- 15 Q. They act on instructions from whom?
- The reserve is in the agreement, and they're supposed --16
- 17 the company is supposed to increase the reserve as needed.
- 18 company is supposed to tell them to either increase it. If
- 19 they can't, to try to get the shares in different ways like I
- 20 mentioned before. I can repeat it. The way I mentioned it
- 21 before. Either reserves get canceled or they get shares
- 22 canceled to reissue to us. Or they take steps to reauthorize.
- 23 That's all I am asking them to do.
- 24 Why is it you are asking the Court to act now?
- 25 Because the company may not be around in a few months.

They're very, very not easy people. And therefore if the word gets out on that, they're not going to be able to raise money. We'll lose our money here.

MR. MURPHY: No further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else, Mr. Funes?

MR. FUNES: No. That's all we have, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. You can step down,

Mr. Goldstein.

(Witness excused)

THE COURT: I have a few questions and then I'm happy to hear any final remarks.

One, Mr. Funes, has the company's finances, have they improved at all?

MR. FUNES: Your Honor, the finances are expected to improve. The company is expected to increase revenues.

Whatever they reported in the past, I believe the plaintiff is referring to their most recent reports. The company just moved from Colorado to Florida. So there has been a significant period in which the CEO was removed and we have a new CEO. The company again has communicated to the plaintiff that he will honor the contract in how it's offered to save the balance.

The defendant, the defendant had offered to pay his balance.

We are running with whatever funds were borrowed to us. The company is very well aware of its obligations and we want to bring the balance current. The company is working in different

technologies right now in order to raise revenue, but because the company -- the corporation changes we were not able to meet the current obligations.

Now, what the plaintiff is asking your Honor to issue the shares, it's almost -- virtually, it is not impossible but it's very hard. And even if the company were to do that, it would require a shareholder meeting. So even if your Honor were to grant this injunction, that the shareholder meeting could result in the shareholders not agreeing to issue shares. So the defendant would be in automatic contempt of your Honor's order. And which is why it doesn't make any sense.

So we want to make it right for the plaintiff and pay the money back but they will have to wait. And we have made reasonable efforts to render payment. But the defendant is asking for money now, and is asking us to do corporate changes that cannot be done overnight.

So even if your Honor issues his order, it would be ——
the order would almost be non-enforceable and it would put us
in automatic contempt. So we would be again in front of your
Honor weeks or even days from now because the plaintiff will
file for a motion for contempt because we don't issue the
shares and, obviously, that's unenforceable, Judge.

So we want to find — the defendant will honor the payment but we need additional time. This is not something that is subject to a restraining order or a motion for

injunction.

THE COURT: Would plaintiff's counsel like to be heard.

MR. MURPHY: Yes. I think the most important element that Mr. Funes said is that if your Honor issues an order to increase the reserves, it would be unenforceable. There is no evidence of that. In fact, the agreement covers that very possibility. If your Honor looks to Exhibit A of the Goldstein declaration, within Section 12, the company has to issue irrevocable transfer agent instructions upon the execution. Full six million shares of common stock are to be made available for conversions. And the last sentence, the holder of this note, that is Adar, may reasonably request increases from time to time to reserve such amounts, and those amounts are the amount of the minimum of four times the amount of shares required if the note will be fully converted.

There is an ongoing obligation that they've already signed on to. It is fully enforceable, your Honor.

THE COURT: As a practical matter, what is going to happen? It seems like they didn't keep the reserves that they were required to keep, right? So what is going to happen as a practical matter?

MR. MURPHY: As a practical matter, upon your Honor's order, they would risk -- they would subject themselves to contempt if they didn't immediately respond by having a

shareholders meeting. And at the shareholders meeting they would authorize the issuance of additional stock. They would fulfill the required minimum reserve of four times to convert the full amount of the note and they would honor the -- the pending conversion request by Adar, and then Adar would be in a position to send additional conversion requests as needed to pay down the note.

THE COURT: Mr. Funes, why are you not obligated to do that?

MR. FUNES: To call for a special meeting for shareholders, your Honor? Is that what you're asking?

THE COURT: Yes. To respond as required by the contract.

MR. FUNES: We can call for a special meeting. But what if the outcome of the meeting is that the shareholders do not agree to issue additional shares? Because the shareholders are not bound by this agreement. Even if they understand the nature of the agreement, if it's financially not feasible for the corporation to issue shares at the time, then no shareholder may vote for this resolution.

THE COURT: I assume the shareholders will be advised of the company's obligations under the contract, right?

MR. FUNES: Sure. We could do that. But again, the outcome is not guaranteed. And issuing that restraining order or temporary injunction for us to comply with something that we

don't know the outcome of this, it would be highly prejudicial for the defendant, not to mention that Puget is incorporated in Nevada so we're subject not only to state regulation in regard to this new issuance of shares. Again, the contract has not contemplated that specific issue.

But, we would make reasonable efforts, your Honor, if it is necessary, to have a shareholders meeting to exercise an election to vote for additional shares. But again, this is not something that will be definitely — is not a definite guarantee that it will result in a positive outcome that the plaintiff is waiting for, which is additional issuance of shares.

THE COURT: I assume the shareholders will be informed of the consequences of failing to comply with the court order.

Am I right?

MR. FUNES: Yes, your Honor. I don't believe any shareholder would like to be in -- any shareholder would like to have their company that they have invested in be in violation, but again, it is a voluntary vote. Having the shareholders vote for something, it is almost forcing them to vote for the specific election where some voters have the option to vote no and others want --

THE COURT: Frankly, it seem likes what you are saying is it is just not convenient at this point in time for your client to comply with this agreement.

MR. FUNES: Not the way -- it is not that it's not convenient, your Honor. We just can't. I mean, we would like to have the option to comply. But we need additional time. Right now, yes, your Honor, I would agree it is not convenient, as of right now. But to immediately comply with the clauses of the contract is virtually impossible to comply today for example. We would need additional time.

THE COURT: So Mr. Murphy, I'm happy to hear you out otherwise. I just have a few questions. So first on the timing, if in fact Puge has to go back and take steps to authorize more shares, what is going to happen in terms of the timing, the time in between?

MR. MURPHY: In our view what will happen is there will be continued volatility. So for example, there was volatility on Monday when we first met, and there is volatility still today. And there is risk. For every day of risk, it's a problem for Adar. But, Adar would like, as Mr. Goldstein pointed out in his testimony, the ball to get rolling in some way. The initial request for the share to be increased was on September 9. We're almost two months from that.

THE COURT: My question is more a practical one. If I am to rule in your favor, which I am inclined to do, is there timing that I should put into the order? So, what defense counsel is saying is, look, we can't do this today, it just won't happen. So it won't be productive to have a contempt

motion tomorrow. So I'm asking if any kind of timing deadline should be put in an order.

MR. MURPHY: I'd like to confer with Mr. Steinmetz on this issue.

THE COURT: Yes.

(Pause)

MR. MURPHY: Your Honor, what we can do with respect to the timing issue, is we'll have to check with the SEC guidelines, there are some guidelines on I believe the first time a meeting can be held for the shareholders on a reasonable notice. So we can draft an order that will include those timing elements.

THE COURT: Okay. I am going to have you do that. I also wanted to ask a specific question about the number of shares. In Mr. Goldstein's declaration and notice of conversion you indicate that Adar is entitled to 4,197,901 shares. But in the memorandum and proposed order that number is 4,197,580. So I want to clarify which number is right and what it is based on.

MR. MURPHY: Of course.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. MURPHY: So, the correct number, your Honor, is in Exhibit J and it is the 4,197,901 number.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. MURPHY: We'll include that also in the proposed

order.

THE COURT: Two more questions. One was that defendants' concern that Adar may act in violation of SEC Rule 144(e)(3)(vi). Would your client be willing to include have some reference to the fact that in the opinion that it furnishes to Puge that Adar will comply with the requirements of the SEC rule?

MR. MURPHY: Of course, your Honor.

THE COURT: So why don't we include that as well in the proposed order.

Finally, with respect to the bond, I do think a bond is appropriate here. But I think what may be best is to place the proceeds of the sale of any converted stock, that amount, into an escrow account. That's what Judge Schwartz did in Netwolves, which I think is appropriate here in terms of the volatility of the stock. Would that be feasible to figure out what the worth of the stock is and put that amount in escrow.

MR. MURPHY: I don't believe there will be any issue with that, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. MURPHY: I can't imagine that there would be. So our concern is that the dates may be difficult, we have to peg it to a particular date.

THE COURT: Right. Right. So do you want to talk about that for a minute, think that out, and let me know.

1 MR. MURPHY: Sure. 2 (Pause) 3 MR. FUNES: I think we have to -- are you asking 4 everyone, Judge? 5 THE COURT: I'm happy to hear you out on that, Mr. 6 Funes. 7 MR. FUNES: In terms of timing when to call the -- are you talking about the bond or are you talking about when to 8 9 call the special meeting? 10 THE COURT: We already talked about the separate 11 meeting, and plaintiff's counsel indicated that it was going to review the SEC rules and submit a proposed order with a date 12 13 that gives sufficient time to set up a shareholders meeting. 14 With respect to the bond I'm waiting to hear plaintiff's 15 response. 16 MR. FUNES: Now, your Honor, it is the plaintiff is 17 required to put this bond for us? 18 THE COURT: Correct. Okay. Also, your Honor, I need 19 MR. FUNES: 20 clarification as to the shareholders meeting. What is the 21 outcome result in the shareholders voting for no more shares to be issued or shares that are under 4 million? 22 23 THE COURT: I'm sorry. Are you just asking what 24 happens if the company refuses to comply with a court order? 25 Is that what you're asking?

MR. FUNES: Yes, your Honor. Again, that it is a shareholders meeting, and so basically you're imposing all shareholders who are individuals to vote for a resolution where actually, you know, it is an election. So they should be shareholders are free to vote either yes or no to a resolution.

THE COURT: Do you want to respond?

MR. STEINMETZ: Your Honor, I think the company would be held in contempt, not individual shareholders.

THE COURT: That's exactly right. Did you hear that,
Mr. Funes?

MR. FUNES: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: It is the company that would be held in contempt. It is the company that's a defendant. It is the company that's a signatory to the agreement. And it is obligated to comply with the agreement that it entered into.

MR. FUNES: I understand that, your Honor.

THE COURT: Did you want to respond, did you want to make any additional comments about the bond or otherwise?

MR. STEINMETZ: I did, your Honor. Perhaps what we can do with the bond, since it is difficult to peg a particular price at which plaintiff may be able to sell these, to keep profits, what we can do is as an ongoing — and I need to talk to the client as to feasibility but this might be possible. There is a \$7,000 pending conversion. Profits earned beyond \$7,000 could be kept in escrow. If the stock goes down and no

money is made, the client wouldn't be out. If the client did make money, those funds would be kept in escrow so the client wouldn't benefit. They just wouldn't lose. They would maintain the status quo.

THE COURT: Let me just take a break for a minute or two. Let me finalize my ruling and I'll come out and read the ruling into the record.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. FUNES: Very well, your Honor.

(Recess)

THE COURT: Mr. Funes, you still on the line?

MR. FUNES: Hello.

THE COURT: Hi. This is Judge Abrams. I'm ready to rule. Can you hear me?

MR. FUNES: Yes, your Honor. Just one qualification. I would like to know if this is a partial ruling, because I'm not clear whether the plaintiff has met the standard which refers to immediate or irreparable harm. Because even if the order says that he is, then that would be contrary to what he -- what Mr. Goldstein said, that an issuance of shares a shareholder meeting could take weeks, if not months, and also the plaintiff is supposed to check the SEC regulations. I want to make sure that whether it is a partial ruling because your, Honor, I believe that at least the immediate or irreparable harm element has not been met.

THE COURT: I disagree with you. I'm going to state my ruling. You can get the transcript from the court reporter and review it. And as I already started to discuss, I am going to have plaintiffs submit a proposed order consistent with this ruling and the issues that I raised earlier.

As a preliminary matter, jurisdiction is proper in this court. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1331, and by the terms of their securities purchase agreement, the parties have waived any objections to jurisdiction and venue and agreed not to assert any defense based on forum non conveniens.

Adar Bays is seeking a preliminary injunction against Puge Technologies which would (1) require Puge to deliver 4,197,901 shares of common stock to Adar, along with the necessary corporate resolutions; (2) require Puge to accept the contractually required legal opinions furnished to it by Adar to enable Adar to sell its Puge common stock publicly without restriction; and (3) require Puge and its agents to honor during the pendency of this action and in accordance with the law, and the agreement between the parties, all future conversion requests Adar duly submits, and to deliver all necessary corporate resolutions and legal opinions to enable Adar to sell Puge common stock publicly without restriction.

For the reasons that I will state I'm granting plaintiff's request for a preliminary injunction. As I stated,

the particular language in the order still needs to be determined.

The preliminary injunction standard is familiar. A preliminary injunction is merited only where the moving party can show irreparable harm absent an injunction, and either a likelihood of success on the merits or sufficiently serious questions going to the merits to make them a fair ground for litigation, and a balance of hardships decidedly tipping in the moving party's favor.

When seeking a mandatory injunction that would alter status quo by demanding that the Court order affirmative action, as Adar is here, the movant must make a clear or substantial showing that he or she is entitled to the relief requested. See the Second Circuit's decision in *Tim Doherty Associates*, 50 F.3d at 34. If issued, the injunction here would compel Puge to convert \$7,000 of the outstanding principal on the note for nearly 4.2 million shares of Puge common stock.

Defendants have met this standard with respect to success on merits. Section 4(a) of the note entitles Adar at its option at any time to convert all or any amount of the principal face amount of the note then outstanding into shares of Puge's common stock. That's from the Goldstein declaration Exhibit A at two. Puge is obligated to effect such a conversion within three days of being served notice of

conversion. Section 11 of the note also requires Puge to instruct its counsel to either (1) write a 144 opinion to allow for saleability of the conversion shares or (2) accept such opinion from Adar's counsel. *Id.* at 6.

On October 15, 2015, Adar executed and delivered a notice of conversion to Puge in which it elected to convert \$7,000 of the note's outstanding principal for nearly 4.2 million shares of Puge's common stock. Goldstein declaration Exhibit G. Despite honoring three of Adar's previous requests for conversion, Puge failed to turn over the common stock within three days of the notice, and has not remedied the failure.

Defendants argue that plaintiff has not shown that it will succeed on the merits for two reasons. First, Puge argues that because the parties have conflicting interpretations of the agreement, Adar has not met its burden of showing it is likely to succeed on the merits. Specifically, Puge claims that it does not have a sufficient number of authorized shares to issue the 4.2 million shares to Adar, and that this situation was not contemplated by their agreement.

I find that the terms of the agreement are not ambiguous. Section 12 of the note provides Puge should at all times reserve a minimum of four times the amount of shares required if the note would be fully converted. Goldstein declaration Exhibit A at 6.

By the terms of the note, Puge assumed the responsibility to ensure that there was a sufficient number of shares to allow Adar to convert the outstanding balance of the note. Puge's apparent inability to comply with this term of the contract does not render the agreement ambiguous. In short, Puge's failure to comply with one provision of the note keeping a sufficient number of shares in reserve does not excuse its performance under no provision of the note —— its obligation to honor Adar's conversion request. See Judge Lynch's opinion in Castle Creek Technology Partners, 2002 WL 31958696 at *7.

Second, Puge argues that issuing the shares to Adar would violate SEC Rule 144 which places certain limitations on the sale of restricted securities. 17 C.F.R. 230.144(a)(3)(i). Specifically, Puge alleges Adar will violate Rule 144(e)(3)(vi) if permitted to obtain the 4.2 million shares. The rule provides that when two or more parties act in concert for the purpose of selling securities of an issuer, all securities of the same class sold during any three-month period shall be aggregated for the purpose of determining applicable volume limitations. This rule is not a valid defense to this injunction. It does not interfere with Adar's right to convert outstanding debt for common stock, but simply limits the amount of stock Adar may sell within a three-month period. See the Netwolves case, 2001 WL 492463 at *11.

In light of Adar's conversion right and the evidence that Puge was served with a duly executed conversion notice, I find that Adar has made a substantial showing that it is entitled to Puge's common stock, and that Puge is required to accept an opinion from Adar's counsel to allow for the sale of the conversion shares, and that the opinion shall indicate that Adar will comply with Rule 144(e)(3)(vi).

Adar has also shown that they may suffer irreparable harm if the injunction is not granted. To show irreparable harm, a plaintiff must show an injury is actual, imminent, and cannot be remedied by an award of monetary damages. While purely financial injury is generally not enough to warrant injunctive relief, the Second Circuit has held that a defendant's imminent insolvency can constitute irreparable harm. See the Brenntag International Chemicals case, 175 F.3d at 249-50. Courts in this district have accordingly provided parties with injunctive relief where the moving party offers evidence that the defendant may not be able to pay damages at the conclusion of the litigation. See the Alpha Capital Anstalt case, docket number 11 CV 6458.

Adar has presented considerable evidence that Puge is on the brink of insolvency. Puge disclosed in its

September 23, 2015, quarterly report, form 10-QA, that the company has incurred losses since inception resulting in an accumulated deficit of \$1,505,530 as of July 31, 2015, and

further losses are anticipated in the development of its business, raising substantial doubt about the company's ability to continue as a going concern. See the Goldstein declaration Exhibit J at page 7.

Puge's balance sheet further evidences its precarious financial position. Puge's liabilities amount to over three times that of its current assets. Puge has \$327,119 in assets and approximately \$1.2 million in liabilities. Id. at 4. And Puge's cash flow suggests that there is little prospect for improvement. Puge reported an operating loss of \$725,503 for the nine months ending July 31, 2015. Id. at 5. Although the company's filings allude to plans to raise capital and take on additional debt, no concrete proposal was outlined. With only \$15,484 cash on hand, the company stated that their cash balance along with anticipated revenue from sales may not be sufficient to cover expenses it will incur during the next 12 months. Goldstein declaration Exhibit J at 16.

Nothing, I should add, that Mr. Funes argued today was anything beyond mere speculation.

In sum, Adar has adduced ample and specific evidence that Puge is on the cusp of insolvency and would likely be unable to pay damages at the conclusion of litigation. See Castle Creek Technology Partners 2002 WL 31958696 at *4.

Defendants argue that plaintiff is not entitled to equitable relief because it acted with unclean hands. Puge

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

argue that the terms of the contract are unconscionable and tainted by deception, fraud and misrepresentations. successfully assert the equitable defense of unclean hands, defendant must establish that the plaintiff acted in bad faith and the defendants were injured by the conduct. Defendants have not carried their burden here. Beyond blanket allegations, Puge points to only one specific act which it alleges is fraudulent. Adar included in the securities purchase agreement a funding lock up clause which barred Puge from entering another loan for 30 days. Puge alleges that Adar somehow forced Puge to violate this provision by colluding with another lender, causing Puge to enter another contract on the same day as entered the agreement with Adar. Because the second agreement contained the same lock up provision, Puge was immediately in default of both agreements. Yet, Puge does not make clear exactly how Adar forced it to agree to both Moreover, Puge does not allege that Adar sought to recover based on this breach, and this breach is not the basis of the current motion.

Beyond this one instance, Puge makes only conclusory allegations that violated numerous state and federal securities laws without any sworn affidavit to support its factual claims. With only bare allegations, the Court is unable to find that Adar acted in bad faith.

Accordingly, the motion for preliminary injunction is

granted. As discussed, the defendants will have to deliver to plaintiff 4,197,901 shares of common stock in accordance with the 8 percent convertible redeemable note, and to accept legal opinions to allow for the stock sale. The legal opinions shall specify that any sale of Puge stock will be in accordance with SEC Rule 144(e)(3)(vi).

In complying with the order, defendant will make all reasonable efforts to increase the number of authorized shares, and the plaintiff shall submit a proposed order specifying the amount of time appropriate to do so. Defendants are also ordered to honor plaintiff's future requests for conversion insofar as they are in accordance with the note.

Plaintiff argues that a bond is not necessary here. Rule 65(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that the Court may issue a preliminary injunction only if the movant gives security in an amount that the Court considers proper to pay the costs and damages sustained by any party found to have been wrongfully enjoined or restrained.

While the rule reads as mandatory, as plaintiff points out, it is within the District Court's discretion not to require a bond where there is no risk that defendant will incur damages. See the Second Circuit's decision in Maryland Casualty Company, 107 F.3d at 985.

Here, there are allegations of fraud, however undeveloped, which relate to the note at issue. Therefore, I

cannot conclude there is no risk that the defendants will incur damages while the injunction is in place. Accordingly, plaintiff is ordered to deposit into an escrow account of their legal counsel the profits of any sale of the Puge stock obtained from the \$7,000 conversion and future conversions for the payment of such costs and damages as may be incurred by defendants if a court later finds that defendants have been wrongfully enjoined. Such proceeds will remain in escrow until an application to release them, and the Court so orders their release.

So how long do you think it will take you to submit a proposed order, Mr. Murphy?

MR. MURPHY: I think tomorrow, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So I'll look at that tomorrow and hopefully we can get that out. And still I'd urge you to the extent possible to try to work together to resolve this.

MR. MURPHY: If Mr. Funes is available tomorrow, we'll call him again.

MR. FUNES: Yes. That sounds good, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. We are adjourned. And you should get the transcript from the court reporter.

MR. MURPHY: Of course, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thanks. Have a nice evening.

1	INDEX OF EXAMINATION	
2	Examination of:	Page
3	ARYEH GOLDSTEIN	
4	Direct By Mr. Murphy	5
5	Cross By Mr. Funes	12
6	Redirect By Mr. Murphy	20
7	PLAINTIFF EXHIBITS	
8	Exhibit No.	Received
9	A	9
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		